

ISSP study monitoring 2005: report to the ISSP General Assembly on monitoring work undertaken for the ISSP by GESIS-ZUMA, Germany

Scholz, Evi; Harkness, Janet; Faaß, Timo

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Verzeichnis, Liste, Dokumentation / list

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Scholz, E., Harkness, J., & Faaß, T. (2008). *ISSP study monitoring 2005: report to the ISSP General Assembly on monitoring work undertaken for the ISSP by GESIS-ZUMA, Germany*. (GESIS-Methodenberichte, 4/2008). Mannheim: GESIS-ZUMA. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-206882>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer Deposit-Lizenz (Keine Weiterverbreitung - keine Bearbeitung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

Terms of use:

This document is made available under Deposit Licence (No Redistribution - no modifications). We grant a non-exclusive, non-transferable, individual and limited right to using this document. This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

GESIS-Methodenberichte Nr. 4/2008

**ISSP Study Monitoring 2005
Report to the ISSP General Assembly
on monitoring work undertaken for the ISSP
by GESIS-ZUMA, Germany**

Evi Scholz, Janet Harkness and Timo Faaß
March 2008

GESIS-ZUMA
Quadrat B2, 1
Postfach 12 21 55
D- 68072 Mannheim

Telephone: Int+ 49+ (0) 621 1246-283
Telefax: Int+ 49+ (0) 621 1246-100
E-mail: evi.scholz@gesis.org

GESIS-Methodenberichte

Die GESIS ist ein Institut der Leibniz-Gemeinschaft.

ISSN:
Herausgeber, Druck
und Vertrieb:

1865-7575
GESIS
Postfach 12 21 55, 68072 Mannheim

Printed in Germany

Contents

Introduction	3
Summary of the findings	5
Language(s) and translation	5
Survey question coverage and context	5
Sampling.....	6
Data collection.....	6
Information on response and outcome figures	7
Data	8
Documentation	8
References	8
Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2005	10
Monitoring Findings Chart.....	15
Appendix	48
Calculation of Response Figures Based on Reported Figures	50
ISSP Study Monitoring Questionnaires for Face-to-Face and Mail Surveys.....	51

Introduction

Standards of “best practices for survey and public opinion research” such as published by the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) call for quality checks at each stage of the survey process lifecycle. Defining standards and establishing benchmarks for good or best practices is an important step towards enabling quality to be assessed. A similarly critical step involves defining the criteria by which one or the other category or standard is to be defined. The American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) guidelines on best practices and its definitions of nonresponse (The American Association for Public Opinion Research 2006) are good examples of such guidelines and definitions. Without documentation, however, quality assessment is impossible and quality improvement unlikely (Harkness 1999, Mohler and Uher 2003). Reporting outcomes is also a useful way of encouraging improvement in procedures (Lynn 2001). In numerous instances, the ISSP Study Monitoring documentation has resulted in improved standards in the ISSP.

Study monitoring involves collecting information on study design and every stage of implementation, requiring researchers to disclose their procedures and outcomes. If conducted while a study is happening, monitoring is the key to intervention which can reduce survey error. It is critical in controlling the quality of procedures and outcomes and plays an important role in helping projects improve design and implementation. Timely and ongoing lifecycle process monitoring is an important tool to reduce survey error during the relevant stage of implementation, whether this be design, data collection or data editing. However, as Mohler, Pennell and Hubbard (2008) note; “Standards in survey documentation have evolved in parallel with the technological and methodological developments in survey research. In just a few decades, paper documents describing the contents of rectangular data files (i.e., codebooks) have been replaced with on-line access to documents that both describe and facilitate analysis of complex hierarchical and/or relational databases. Despite these advances, examples of complete or even adequate survey documentation remain surprisingly rare.”

Cross-national Study Monitoring as pioneered in the ISSP represents a special case of survey documentation and study monitoring. ISSP Study Monitoring and Study Monitoring Reports as carried out by GESIS-ZUMA is monitoring *after the event*. The aim of ISSP monitoring and reports is at least twofold. From the beginning (cf. Park and Jowell 1997), one goal was to monitor and record for internal ISSP purposes how ISSP studies were conducted in each country and how implementations met or failed to meet ISSP requirements as defined by the ISSP Working Principles. These aims are related to the pursuit of basic good or best practices in ISSP studies but also to comparability of data across ISSP datasets. Data quality in cross-

national studies is not only a matter of quality procedures but also of comparability across data sets and across the procedures resulting in these data sets (Harkness 1999, Mohler and Uher 2003, Scholz and Klein 2003). Comparability in this context operates on many levels (cf. Lyberg et al. 1997, Lynn et al. 2006, Harkness 2008).

For users of ISSP data, the Study Monitoring Reports bring together information of relevance for analysis not otherwise available in such compact form. The documentation provided on major aspects of each member's fielding and outcomes goes a considerable way towards guiding researchers on which differences between ISSP countries they might ignore and which they should consider. We note that the study documentation available for the European Social Survey, supported by EU funding and introduced in a different historical context, has benefited from but also goes beyond the documentation provided by the ISSP.

The ISSP is a collaborative survey programme with members from all over the world with an annual module on a topic important for social science research. The programme started about 20 years ago with four General Social Surveys as founding members and counts 42 member countries in 2007. Figure 1 lists the current ISSP members and illustrates which different cultural contexts ISSP covers nowadays.

Figure 1: ISSP Member Countries 2007



The following report is based on the study monitoring survey conducted by GESIS-ZUMA for the ISSP on the 2005 Work Orientations module.

Thirty-one member countries archived the 2005 Work Orientations module, all of them have completed the monitoring questionnaire. Details of the individual answers members provided are presented in the summary chart which follows here. We have done our best to summarise the answers we received and to check the information with members. Members were given the opportunity to make corrections before the report is made available on the Archive web site as a supplement to the 2005 Codebook.

Summary of the findings

Language(s) and translation

(see pages 16-21 of the Findings Chart)

From 1999 on, the SMQ asks whether members checked or evaluated their translations. All of the twenty-seven countries that produced translations checked or evaluated them (the Swiss Italian is an exception). Twelve countries did not pre-test the translated questionnaire¹ (Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Israel, Latvia, Norway, Portugal, Russia, Slovenia, Spain, and Sweden). The Philippines and South Africa fielded in five languages, Switzerland and Israel in three languages and Canada, Finland, Latvia, and the USA in two languages. All the other member countries fielded in one language.

Some countries reported translation problems (Germany and Dominican Republic).

Survey question coverage and context

(see pages 22-24 of the Findings Chart)

One country (Czech Republic) did not include all of the core items. Three members (Canada, Dominican Republic, and Flanders) omitted background variables, usually by mistake.

In 2005, twenty-three countries fielded the ISSP module as part of a larger survey. A question in the SMQ asking for information about studies (topic, study title, etc.) the ISSP was fielded with is included in the report (see appendix).

¹ Finland did a pre-test for the Finnish but not for the Swedish version. The Philippines did a pre-test for Tagalog but not for the other four languages the survey was fielded in. South Africa did a pre-test for Afrikaans but not for the other four languages the survey was fielded in.

Sampling

(see pages 25-31 of the Findings Chart)

The sampling procedures and details reported for the 2005 module are for the most part similar to those reported in earlier years. Four countries reported using substitution of different kinds: Cyprus, Latvia, Russia, and Spain.

Finland and France had a lower age cut-off at 15 years, Japan and South Africa had a cut-off at 16 years; all other members had a lower age cut-off at 18 years of age. Five countries reported an upper age cut-off (Finland at 74, Flanders at 85, Latvia at 75, Norway and Sweden at 79).

Data collection

(see pages 32-40 of the Findings Chart)

MODES

Essentially the ISSP questionnaires are administered as face-to-face interviews or in a self-completion format. Four countries combined several modes in fielding, usually as a result of fielding the ISSP module together with another study and administering the background variables for both studies face-to-face and the ISSP as self-completion (Flanders, Germany, Great Britain, and South Korea).

Two countries using an interviewer-administered mode had two advance contacts, letter and telephone call (Flanders and Taiwan). Seven countries had advance letters (Germany, Great Britain, Hungary, Japan, Slovenia, Switzerland, and the USA); The Dominican Republic, Portugal, and South Korea had a telephone pre-contact. Eight countries conducted their survey by mail (see table on page 39-40). Of these, Australia, Canada, Norway and Sweden had four or more, Finland and New Zealand had three, Denmark and France had two mailings. The number of mailings is usually seen as relevant for enhancing response (Dillman 2000). Denmark and Sweden had a telephone reminder. In Denmark, about 20% of the interviews were collected by telephone; the mode variable identifies these. Telephone interviews are not permitted in the ISSP.

INCENTIVES

Twelve countries reported they had used incentives, either to the respondent or to the interviewer. Of these, Japan and South Korea offered incentives both to respondents and interviewers; Great Britain, Russia, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Taiwan, and the USA only to respondents; and Slovenia and Spain only to interviewers. This detailed

information was collected in the SMQ 2005 for the first time. Between 2001 and 2004, the SMQ only asked about incentives in general.

FIELDING DATES

Dates of fielding for the 2005 module range from 2005 to 2007:

2005	23 countries
2005-2006	1 country
2006	6 countries
2006-2007	1 country

Japan had the shortest fielding period, with seven days, Canada had the longest, with about 34 weeks.

In twenty-one of twenty-three countries using interviewer-administered modes, interviewers approached addresses or households at different times of day and at different days of the week; in two countries at different times of day only (Latvia and South Korea).

Countries differ considerably in the number of required contact attempts. The minimum required number of calls at an address or a household ranges from none (Cyprus, USA²) to five (Flanders, Slovenia, South Korea, and Switzerland). Nine countries supervised interviews (proportions ranging between 1%-60%). With one exception (Japan), countries using interviewer-administered modes back-checked interviews (proportions ranging between 5%-100%).

Information on response and outcome figures

(see pages 41-42 of the Findings Chart)

Substitution and, in some cases, a lack of sufficient detail are the two main obstacles to calculating response rates for some of the ISSP 2005 studies (cf. reasons mentioned in the Park and Jowell report (1997) and expanded in the overview of the 1996-1998 monitoring studies, Harkness, Langfeldt, and Scholz, 2001). Members also differ in their definitions of outcome codes – of what counts as “eligible“, “ineligible“, or “partially completed interviews“, and so forth.

The raw figures for eligible samples and final outcomes indicate, nevertheless, that the range in the ISSP is considerable – from about 17% to over 85% for the module.

² USA with no fixed minimum; most difficult cases are approached 10 or more times.

Data

(see pages 43-46 of the Findings Chart)

The great majority of members employed various measures of coding reliability, for the most part logic or consistency checks and range checks, followed by either individual or automatic corrections or both.

Seventeen of thirty-one countries applied subsequent weights or post-stratification to correct for errors of selection or response bias.

Documentation

(see page 47 of the Findings Chart)

Fifteen countries reported they had a national methods report available (Australia, Canada, Flanders, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Norway, the Philippines, Russia, Slovenia, South Korea, Sweden, Switzerland, Taiwan, and USA). This information was not collected in the SMQ until the 2001 module.

References

The American Association for Public Opinion Research (2006): Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys. 4th edition. Lenexa, Kansas: AAPOR. (available online http://www.aapor.org/pdfs/standarddefs_4.pdf)

American Association for Public Opinion Research (2005): Best Practices for Survey and Public Opinion Research. (available online http://www.aapor.org/default.asp?page=survey_methods/standards_and_best_practices/best_practices_for_survey_and_public_opinion_research)

Dillman, D. A. (2000): Mail and Internet Surveys. The Tailored Design Method. 2. Edition. New York: Wiley.

Harkness, J. (2008) "Comparative Survey Research: Goals and Challenges." Foundation chapter" in De Leeuw, E., Hox., J. and Dillman, D. (eds.) *International Handbook of Survey Methodology*, Hyattsville, VA: Erlbaum.

Harkness, J. (1999): In Pursuit of Quality: Issues for Cross-national Survey Research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 2: 125-140.

Harkness, J., Langfeldt, B. and Scholz, E. (2001): ISSP Study Monitoring 1996-1998, Reports to the ISSP General Assembly on monitoring work undertaken for the ISSP by ZUMA, Germany, Mai 2001. (available online with the 1996-1998 codebooks)

Lyberg, L., Biemer, P. P., Collins, M., De Leeuw, E. D., Dippo, C., Schwarz, N., Trewin, D. (1997): *Survey Measurement and Process Quality*. New York: Wiley.

Lynn, P., Japac, L., and Lyberg, L. (2006): What's So Special About Cross-National Surveys? In J. A. Harkness (ed.) *Conducting Cross-National and Cross-Cultural Surveys. Papers from the 2005 Meeting of the International Workshop on Comparative Survey Design and Implementation (CSDI)*. Mannheim: ZUMA-Nachrichten Spezial, 12: 7-20.

Lynn, P. (2001): *Developing Quality Standards for Cross-National Survey Research: Five Approaches*, Working Papers of the Institute for Social and Economic Research, paper 2001-21. Colchester: University of Essex.

Mohler, P. Ph., B.-E. Pennell, and Hubbard, F. (2008): "Survey Documentation: Towards Professional Knowledge Management in Sample Surveys" in De Leeuw, E., Hox., J. and Dillman, D. (eds.) *International Handbook of Survey Methodology*, Hyattsville, VA: Erlbaum.

Mohler, P. Ph. and Uher, R. (2003): Documenting Comparative Surveys for Secondary Analysis, in J. A. Harkness, F. J. R. Van de Vijver, and P. Ph. Mohler (ed.) *Cross-Cultural Survey Methods*, New York: Wiley.

Park, A. and Jowell, R. (1997): Consistencies and differences in a cross-national survey. The International Social Survey Programme (1995). (available online with the 1995 codebook)

Scholz, E. and Klein, S. (2003): Study Monitoring in the ISSP, ZUMA-Nachrichten, 52: 139-152.

Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2005

(based on Central Archive and ZUMA documentation, July, 2007: Australia to Denmark)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report	Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Australia (1984)	1996	✓	No	Canada (1991)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	No			1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	No			2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	No	
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓		2005	✓	✓
Austria (1985)	1996	No		Chile (1997)	1996		
	1997	✓	No		1997		
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
	2005	No	No		2005	No	No
Bangladesh (1997) - (2003)	1996			Cyprus (1995)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	No		1997	✓	✓
	1998	No			1998	✓	No
	1999	No			1999	✓	✓
	2000	(TP)	No		2000	No	
	2001	No			2001	✓	✓
Brazil (1999)	2002	No			2002	✓	✓
	1996				2003	No	
	1997				2004	✓	✓
	1998	(TP)	(✓)		2005	✓	✓
	1999	(TP)	(✓)	Czech Republic (1991)	1996	✓	✓
	2000	No			1997	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2003	No			2000	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2005	No	No		2002	✓	✓
Bulgaria (1991)	1996	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		2005	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓	Denmark (1998)	1996		
	2000	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	2001	No			1998	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		1999	(TP)	(✓)
	2003	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
					2003	✓	✓
					2004	✓	✓
					2005	✓	✓

TP: Data not archived as part of merged ISSP data set because of technical problems with sampling, fielding, or late archiving.

Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2005

(based on Central Archive and ZUMA documentation, July, 2007: The Dominican Republic to Italy)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report	Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
The Dominican Republic (2006)	1996			Great Britain & Northern Ireland* (1984)	1996	✓	✓
	1997				1997	✓	✓
	1998				1998	✓	✓
	1999				1999	✓	✓
	2000				2000	✓	✓
	2001				2001	✓	✓
	2002				2002	✓	✓
	2003				2003	✓	✓
	2004				2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓		2005	✓	✓
Finland (2000)	1996			Hungary (1986)	1996	✓	✓
	1997				1997	✓	✓
	1998				1998	✓	✓
	1999				1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	No	
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓		2005	✓	✓
Flanders (2000)	1996			Ireland (1986)	1996	✓	✓
	1997				1997	(TP)	(✓)
	1998				1998	✓	
	1999				1999	(TP)	(✓)
	2000				2000	✓	✓
	2001				2001	No	
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	No			2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓		2005	✓	✓
France (1995)	1996	✓	✓	Israel (1988)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	No			2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓		2005	✓	✓
Germany (1984)	1996	✓	✓	Italy (2001-2004)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	(No)	
	2000	✓	✓		2000	(No)	
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	No	
	2003	✓	✓		2003		
	2004	✓	✓		2004		
	2005	✓	✓		2005		

TP: Data not archived as part of merged ISSP data set because of technical problems with sampling, fielding, or late archiving.

* 1997, 2003, 2004, and 2005 without Northern Ireland

Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2005
(based on Central Archive and ZUMA documentation, July, 2007: Japan to Russia)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report	Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Japan (1991)	1996	✓	✓	Norway (1988)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓		2005	✓	✓
Latvia (1997)	1996	✓	✓	Philippines (1989)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	No			1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓		2005	✓	✓
Mexico (2000)	1996			Poland (1992)	1996	✓	✓
	1997				1997	✓	✓
	1998				1998	✓	✓
	1999				1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	No	
	2001	No			2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	No			2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓		2005	No	No
Netherlands (1985)	1996	No		Portugal (1995)	1996	No	
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	(TP)	(✓)		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	No	
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	No*	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
	2005	No	No		2005	✓	✓
New Zealand (1990)	1996	✓	✓	Russia (1990)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓		2005	✓	✓

TP: Data not archived as part of merged ISSP data set because of technical problems with sampling, fielding, or late archiving.

* data delivery late; not integrated in common data file

Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2005
(based on Central Archive and ZUMA documentation, July, 2007: Slovak Republic to USA)

Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report	Country (member since)	Module	Archived	Study Report
Slovak Republic (1996, re- instated)	1996	No		Sweden (1992)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	No			1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	No			2000	✓	✓
	2001	No			2001	No	
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
	2005	No	No		2005	✓	✓
Slovenia (1992)	1996	✓	✓	Switzerland (1999)	1996		
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	No
	1999	✓	✓		1999	(TP)	(✓)
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓		2005	✓	✓
South Africa (2001, re- instated)	1996			Taiwan (2001)	1996		
	1997				1997		
	1998				1998		
	1999				1999		
	2000				2000		
	2001	✓	✓		2001		
	2002	No			2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓		2005	✓	✓
South Korea (2003)	1996			Uruguay (2003)	1996		
	1997				1997		
	1998				1998		
	1999				1999		
	2000				2000		
	2001				2001		
	2002				2002		
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓		2005	No	No
Spain (1993)	1996	✓	✓	USA (1984)	1996	✓	✓
	1997	✓	✓		1997	✓	✓
	1998	✓	✓		1998	✓	✓
	1999	✓	✓		1999	✓	✓
	2000	✓	✓		2000	✓	✓
	2001	✓	✓		2001	✓	✓
	2002	✓	✓		2002	✓	✓
	2003	✓	✓		2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓		2004	✓	✓
	2005	✓	✓		2005	✓	✓

TP: Data not archived as part of merged ISSP data set because of technical problems with sampling, fielding, or late archiving.

Chart of Archive and Report Delivery 1996–2005

(based on Central Archive and ZUMA documentation, July, 2007: Venezuela)

Venezuela (1999)	1996		
	1997		
	1998		
	1999	No	
	2000	No	
	2001	No	
	2002	No	
	2003	✓	✓
	2004	✓	✓
	2005	No	No

2005

Monitoring Findings Chart

2005

for

Australia (AUS)
Bulgaria (BG)
Canada (CDN)
Switzerland (CH)
Cyprus (CY)
Czech Republic (CZ)
Germany (D)
Denmark (DK)
Dominican Republic (DO)
Spain (E)
France (F)
Finland (FIN)
Flanders (FL)
Great Britain (GB)
Hungary (H)
Israel (IL)
Ireland (IRL)
Japan (J)
Latvia (LV)
Mexico (MEX)
Norway (N)
New Zealand (NZ)
Portugal (P)
South Korea (ROK)
The Philippines (RP)
Russia (RUS)
Sweden (S)
Slovenia (SLO)
Taiwan (TW)
United States of America (USA)
South Africa (ZA)

Language(s) and translation

	AUS	BG	CDN	CH	CY	CZ	D	DK	DO	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>																
	Language 1 (L1)	English	Bulgarian		Greek	Czech	German	Danish	Spanish	Spanish	French	Finnish	Dutch	English	Hungarian	Hebrew
	Language 2 (L2)			English French								Swedish				Arabic
	Language 3 (L3)			Italian												Russian
<i>Was the questionnaire translated?</i>																
Yes, translated: - by member(s) of research team - by translation bureau - by specially trained translator(s) - other																
		X		L2	X	X	X	X		X	X		X		X	
												L2	X			
		X	L2	L1, L3			X									L1-3
									X ^{DO}			L1, L2 ^{FIN}				
No, not translated	X		L1											X		

^{DO} Questionnaire was translated by an assessment team which is composed of experts in this area (Asian Research Group).
^{FIN} Both questionnaires translated by a translation unit inside the research institute.

Translation (continued)

	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NZ	P	ROK	RP	RUS	S	SLO	TW	USA	ZA	
Language(s) of the fielded module																
	Language 1 (L1)	English	Japanese	Latvian	Spanish	Norwegian	English	Portuguese	Korean	Tagalog	Russian	Swedish	Slovenian	Chinese	English	Tsonga
	Language 2 (L2)			Russian						Ilocano					Spanish	Tswana
	Language 3 (L3)			Russian						Bicolano						Venda
	Language 4 (L4)									Cebuano						Zulu
Language 5 (L5)										Ilonggo					Afrikaans	
Was the questionnaire translated?																
Yes, translated:																
- by member(s) of research team		X	L1, L2		X		X	X	L1			X	X			
- by translation bureau		X									X					
- by specially trained translator(s)				X							X	X			L2	
- other									L2-L5 ^{Rp}							
No, not translated	X					X								L1		

^{RP} Translated by field anchors, whose native languages are Ilocano, Bicolano, Cebuano and Ilonggo respectively, and who have practice in translating.

Translation (continued)

	AUS	BG	CDN	CH	CY	CZ	D	DK	DO	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>																
Language 1 (L1)	English	Bulgarian	English	German	Greek	Czech	German	Danish	Spanish	Spanish	French	Finnish	Dutch	English	Hungarian	Hebrew
Language 2 (L2)			French	French								Swedish				Arabic
Language 3 (L3)				Italian												Russian
<i>Was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated?</i>																
Yes:																
- group discussion		X		L2	X	X	X		X		X				X	L1-3
- expert checked it		X					X		X		X	L1, L2	X			
- back translation			L2						X							
- other				L1 ^{CH}				X ^{DK}	X ^{DO}	X ^E						
No				L3												
Not applicable	X		L1											X		

^{CH} German speaking collaborators of the institute checked the translated questionnaire.

^{DK} Two members of the research team carried out a translation independently of each other. On the basis of these a third member made the final translation.

^{DO} Translation was reviewed by the SRL team of the University of Illinois, Chicago.

^E Another member of the research team and an outside translator worked jointly.

Translation (continued)

	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NZ	P	ROK	RP	RUS	S	SLO	TW	USA	ZA
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>															
	Language 1 (L1)	English	Japanese	Latvian	Spanish	Norwegian	Portuguese	Korean	Tagalog	Russian	Swedish	Slovenian	Chinese	English	Tsonga
	Language 2 (L2)			Russian					Ilocano					Spanish	Tswana
	Language 3 (L3)								Bicolano						Venda
	Language 4 (L4)								Cebuano						Zulu
Language 5 (L5)									Ilonggo						Afrikaans
<i>Was the translated questionnaire assessed/checked or evaluated?</i>															
Yes: - group discussion - expert checked it - back translation - other															
			L1, L2		X		X	X	L1 ^{RP}	X	X	X	X	L2	L1-L5
				X											
		X ^J							L2-L5 ^{RP}						
	Not applicable	X				X								L1	

^J An English bilingual checked the translation.

^{RP} L1: Group discussion with field anchors, pre-tested on 12 randomly selected adults of different ages, sex and classes.

L2-L5: Discussion with field interviewers who can speak the language, i.e., those assigned to implement the questionnaire in the area where the language is spoken.

Translation (continued)

	AUS	BG	CDN	CH	CY	CZ	D	DK	DO	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>																
Language 1 (L1)	English	Bulgarian	English	German	Greek	Czech	German	Danish	Spanish	Spanish	French	Finnish	Dutch	English	Hungarian	Hebrew
Language 2 (L2)			French	French								Swedish				Arabic
Language 3 (L3)				Italian												Russian
<i>Was the questionnaire pre-tested?</i>																
Yes		X		L1-L3	X		X		X			L1	X		X	
No			L2			X		X		X	X	L2				L1-3
Not applicable	X		L1											X		
<i>Were there any questions.. which caused problems when translating?</i>																
Yes							X		X							
No		X	L2	L1-L3	X	X		X		X	X	L1, L2	X		X	L1-3
Not applicable	X		L1											X		

Translation (continued)

	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NZ	P	ROK	RP	RUS	S	SLO	TW	USA	ZA
<i>Language(s) of the fielded module</i>															
Language 1 (L1)	English	Japanese	Latvian	Spanish	Norwegian	English	Portuguese	Korean	Tagalog	Russian	Swedish	Slovenian	Chinese	English	Tsonga
Language 2 (L2)			Russian						Ilocano					Spanish	Tswana
Language 3 (L3)									Bicolano						Venda
Language 4 (L4)									Cebuano						Zulu
Language 5 (L5)									Ilonggo						Afrikaans
<i>Was the questionnaire pre-tested?</i>															
Yes		X		X				X	L1				X	L2	L5
No			L1, L2		X		X		L2-L5	X	X	X			L1-L4
Not applicable	X					X								L1	
<i>Were there any questions.. which caused problems when translating?</i>															
Yes															
No		X	L1, L2	X	X		X	X	L1-L5	X	X	X	X	L2	L1-L5
Not applicable	X					X								L1	

Survey context

	AUS	BG	CDN	CH	CY	CZ	D	DK	DO	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL
<i>How was the ISSP module fielded?</i>																
Individual survey					X				X		X	X				X
Larger survey:																
- with ISSP at start				X	X	X		X								
- with ISSP in middle	X	X					X			X			X		X	
- with ISSP at end							X						X	X		

	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NZ	P	ROK	RP	RUS	S	SLO	TW	USA	ZA
<i>How was the ISSP module fielded?</i>															
Individual survey		X		X							X				
Larger survey:															
- with ISSP at start					X	X	X					X	X		
- with ISSP in middle	X							X	X	X				X	X
- with ISSP at end			X						X						

Question coverage and order

	AUS	BG	CDN	CH	CY	CZ	D	DK	DO	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL
Were the ISSP questions asked in prescribed order?																
Yes	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
No															X	
Were all the core ISSP items included?																
Yes, all included	X	X		X	X		X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X
No, not all included:																
- from module						X										
- background items			X						X ^{DO}				X			

^{DO} Top-bottom is asked as a social class variable with 4 categories.

Question coverage and order (continued)

	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NZ	P	ROK	RP	RUS	S	SLO	TW	USA	ZA
Were the ISSP questions asked in prescribed order?															
Yes	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
No															
Were all the core ISSP items included?															
Yes, all included	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
No, not all included:															
- from module															
- background items															

Sampling

	AUS	BG	CDN	CH	CY	CZ	D	DK	DO	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL
<i>The sample was designed to be representative of...</i>																
...only adult citizens of country	X		X		X	X							X		X	
...adults of any nationality		X		X			X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X ^{IL}
<i>Was your sample designed to be representative of adults living in...</i>																
...private accommodation only		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X
...private & institutional accommodation	X							X					X			
<i>Lower age cut-off</i>																
18	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X
17																
16																
15											X	X				

^{IL} Adult residents of all nationality.

Sampling (continued)

	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NZ	P	ROK	RP	RUS	S	SLO	TW	USA	ZA
<i>The sample was designed to be representative of...</i>															
...only adult citizens of country		X		X				X	X	X	X		X		X
...adults of any nationality	X		X		X	X	X					X		X	
<i>Was your sample designed to be representative of adults living in...</i>															
... <u>private</u> accommodation <u>only</u>	X		X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
... <u>private</u> & <u>institutional</u> accommodation		X			X	X									
<i>Lower age cut-off</i>															
18	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
17															
16		X													
15															X

Sampling (continued)

	AUS	BG	CDN	CH	CY	CZ	D	DK	DO	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL
<i>Was there an upper age cut-off?</i>																
Yes																
Age												74	85			
No	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X
<i>Did you use any variables for stratification?</i>																
Yes	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X
No		X						X			X					
<i>How many stages does your sampling design have?</i>																
One stage	X							X				X				
Two stages		X	X				X				X		X		X	
Three stages				X	X	X			X					X		
Four or more stages										X						X

Sampling (continued)

	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NZ	P	ROK	RP	RUS	S	SLO	TW	USA	ZA
<i>Was there an upper age cut-off?</i>															
Yes															
Age			75		79						79				
No	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
<i>Did you use any variables for stratification?</i>															
Yes	X	X	X	X			X		X	X		X	X	X	X
No					X	X		X			X				
<i>How many stages does your sampling design have?</i>															
One stage						X					X				
Two stages		X			X							X			
Three stages	X		X	X			X	X		X			X		X
Four or more stages									X	X				X	

Sampling (continued)

	AUS	BG	CDN	CH	CY	CZ	D	DK	DO	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL
<i>Does your sampling frame consist of...</i>																
Addresses		X							X		X			X		X
Households			X	X		X										
Named individuals (target persons)	X						X	X				X	X		X	
Named individuals (not the target persons)																
Areas					X					X						
Something else																
<i>What selection method was used to identify a respondent?</i>																
Kish grid				X	X	X				X				X		X
Birthday method		X	X			X					X					
Quota																
Other									X ^{DO}	X ^E						
Not applicable	X						X	X				X	X		X	

^{DO} Trolldhal-Carter-Bryant method

^E Selection according to sex-age distribution of the population in each region.

Sampling (continued)

<i>Does your sampling frame consist of...</i>	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NZ	P	ROK	RP	RUS	S	SLO	TW	USA	ZA
Addresses	X		X												
Households							X	X		X				X	X
Named individuals (target persons)		X			X	X					X	X	X		
Named individuals (not the target persons)															
Areas				X					X						
Something else															
<i>What selection method was used to identify a respondent?</i>															
Kish grid				X					X					X	X
Birthday method	X		X				X	X		X					
Quota															
Other															
Not applicable		X			X	X					X	X	X		

Sampling (continued)

	AUS	BG	CDN	CH	CY	CZ	D	DK	DO	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL
<i>Was substitution of individuals permitted at any stage of selection process or during fieldwork?</i>																
	Yes				X ²					X ^{1,2}	X	X	X	X	X	X
	No	X	X	X		X	X	X	X					X	X	X

	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NZ	P	ROK	RP	RUS	S	SLO	TW	USA	ZA
<i>Was substitution of individuals permitted at any stage of selection process or during fieldwork?</i>															
	Yes		X ²							X ^{1,2}	X				
	No	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X

¹ Substitution of refusals.

² Substitution of non-contacts, people away during survey period, etc.

Data collection

	AUS	BG	CDN	CH	CY	CZ	D	DK	DO	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL
<i>Data collection methods used (substantive & background)?</i>																
Face-to-face		X		X	X	X	X ^b		X	X			X ^b	X ^b	X	X
Self-Completion (with interviewer involvement)							X ^s						X ^s	X ^s		
Self-completion by mail	X		X					X ^{DK}			X	X				
Telephone								X ^{DK} X ^{DK}								
<i>Length of fieldwork</i>																
2 weeks or less		X								X						
Over 2 weeks < 1 month						X			X						X	
1 month < 2 mths																
2 months < 3 mths					X							X				
3 mths or more	X		X	X			X	X			X		X	X		X
<i>Year of fieldwork</i>																
2005	X	X		X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
2006			X				X	X								
2007																

^b background variables
^s substantive variables
DK 80,1% of respondents responded by mail; 19,9% of interviews were completed as telephone interviews.

Data collection (continued)

	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NZ	P	ROK	RP	RUS	S	SLO	TW	USA	ZA
<i>Data collection methods used (substantive & background) ?</i>															
	Face-to-face	X	X	X			X	X ^{ROK} X ^{ROK}	X	X		X	X	X	X
	Self-Completion (with interviewer involvement)														
	Self-completion by mail				X	X					X				
	Telephone														
<i>Length of fieldwork</i>															
	2 weeks or less		X						X	X					
	Over 2 weeks < 1 month			X	X										
	1 month < 2 mths				X	X						X	X		X
	2 months < 3 mths										X		X		
	3 mths or more	X					X	X						X	
<i>Year of fieldwork</i>															
	2005	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X		X
	2006	X					X			X				X	
	2007						X								

^{ROK} 1492 interviews face-to-face; 80 interviews self-completion; 41 done by ‘mixed mode.’

Data collection: face-to-face and self-administered with some interviewer involvement

	BG	CH	CY	CZ	D	DO	E	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL
<i>Were postal or telephone components used?</i>												
Yes - postal components:												
- advance letter		X			X			X	X	X		
- reminder & thank you letters								X	X			
Yes - telephone components						X		X				
No	X		X	X			X				X	X
<i>Were incentives offered?</i>												
Yes:												
- to respondent		X							X			
- to interviewer							X					
No	X		X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X
<i>Were interviewers paid according to realized cases?</i>												
Yes	X	X	X	X	X	X	X ^E	X	X	X	X	X
No												

^E Interviewers were paid per day and according to realized cases.

Data collection: face-to-face and self-administered with some interviewer involvement (continued)

	J	LV	MEX	P	ROK	RP	RUS	SLO	TW	USA	ZA
<i>Were postal or telephone components used?</i>											
Yes - postal components:											
- advance letter	X							X	X	X	
- reminder & thank you letters											
Yes - telephone components				X	X				X		
No		X	X			X	X				X
<i>Were incentives offered?</i>											
Yes:											
- to respondent	X				X		X		X	X	
- to interviewer	X	X	X	X	X	X		X			X
No											
<i>Were interviewers paid according to realized cases?</i>											
Yes	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X
No			X							X	

Data collection: face-to-face and self-administered with some interviewer involvement (continued)

	BG	CH	CY	CZ	D	DO	E	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL
<i>Which of these rules governed how an interviewer approached an address or household?</i>												
Call at different time of day	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Call on different days in week	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
None of these												
<i>Were a minimum number of calls required?</i>												
Yes:												
Minimum number of required calls	2	5		3	4	3	3	5	4	3	4	4
No			X									
<i>Were any interviews supervised?</i>												
Yes:												
Approximate proportion (%)			20			60			5			
No	X	X		X	X		X	X		X	X	X

Data collection: face-to-face and self-administered with some interviewer involvement (continued)

	J	LV	MEX	P	ROK	RP	RUS	SLO	TW	USA	ZA
<i>Which of these rules governed how an interviewer approached an address or household?</i>											
Call at different time of day	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Call on different days in week	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
None of these											
<i>Were a minimum number of calls required?</i>											
Yes:										X ^{USA}	
Minimum number of required calls	3	2	3	4	5	3	3	5	3		3
No											
<i>Were any interviews supervised?</i>											
Yes:											
Approximate proportion (%)			25		7	10			1	10	1
No	X	X		X			X	X			

^{USA} All cases are handled on an individual basis. There is no fixed minimum, but most difficult cases are approached in one way or another 10 or more times.

Data collection: face-to-face and self-administered with some interviewer involvement (continued)

	BG	CH	CY	CZ	D	DO	E	FL	GB	H	IL	IRL
Were any interviews back-checked?												
Yes:												
Approximate proportion (%)	10	20	10	30	100	50 ^{Do}	25	100	10	10	30	10
No												

	J	LV	MEX	P	ROK	RP	RUS	SLO	TW	USA	ZA
Were any interviews back-checked?											
	Yes:										
	Approximate proportion (%)	10	5	36	100	30	15	60	30	20	20
	No	X									

^{Do} At least 20% of the back-checks were made by telephone.

Data collection: mail

	AUS	CDN	DK	F	FIN	N	NZ	S
<i>Were any contacts made by telephone or interviewer?</i>								
	Yes:							
	- reminders by telephone		X ^{DK}					X
	No	X		X	X	X	X	
<i>What was sent out in the first mailing?</i>								
	Questionnaire	X	X	X	X	X	X	
	Data protection information	X	X	X	X	X		X
	Explanatory letter	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Incentive					X	X	
	Other material	X						
<i>What was sent out in the second mailing?</i>								
	Thank you and reminder combined	X		X	X	X		
	Reminder sent only to non-respondents	X	X				X	
	Questionnaire		X	X				X
	Data protection information			X				X
	Explanatory letter			X			X	
	Incentive							X
	Other material							

^{DK} Denmark used a telephone reminder after last mailing.

Data collection: mail (continued)

	AUS	CDN	DK	F	FIN	N	NZ	S
<i>What was sent out in the third mailing?</i>								
Questionnaire	X	X			X	X	X	X
Data protection information	X	X			X	X		X
Explanatory letter	X	X			X	X	X	
Incentive						X		
Other material	X							
No third mailing			X	X				
<i>What was sent out in the fourth (or last) mailing?</i>								
Questionnaire		X				X		X
Data protection information		X				X		X
Explanatory letter		X				X		
Reminder only to non-respondents	X							
Incentive						X		
Other material								
No fourth mailing			X	X	X		X	

Information on response and outcome figures +

	AUS	BG	CDN	CH	CY	CZ	D ^p	DK	DO	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL
<i>Response figures based on reported figures</i>																
Issued sample (n)	5000	1700	3500	2300	1298	2580	3196/1429	2500	2880	1646	10000	2500	2351	2145	2225	1901
Ineligible (n)	12	135	384	146		32	352/132	143	151		290	2	64	191	46	132
Eligible (n)	4988	1565	3116	2154	1298	2548	2844/1297	2357	2729	1646	9710	2498	2287	1954	2179	1769
- refusal (n)	297	196	40	855	87	604	1341/573	393	270	220		17	598	631	427	418
- non-contact (n)	2235	166	2108	45	132	490	192/75	273	401	221	7981	1130	136	51	202	257
- other unproductive (n)	452	78		176	68	228	197/62	93	100	2		6	215	172	538	60
- completed cases (n)	1988	1121	933	1078	1000	1226	1114/587	1597 ^{DK}	1958	1203	1626	1345	1338	913	1012	1034
- partially completed (n)	16	4	35		11			1			103			187		

+ For calculation of response figures, see appendix.

^D Western federal states followed by eastern federal states.

^{DK} 318 telephone interviews included (19,9% of interviews completed)

Information on response and outcome figures (continued)⁺

	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NZ	P	ROK	RP	RUS	S	SLO	TW	USA	ZA
<i>Response figures based on reported figures</i>															
Issued sample (n)	1840	1800	2098	1800	2700	2400	2832	2500	2681	4193	2001	1616	4862	2777	3465
Ineligible (n)	99	133	167	10	35	181	71			168	22	123	176	553	137
Eligible (n)	1741	1667	1931	1790	2665	2219	2761	2500	2681	4025	1979	1493	4686	2224	3328
- refusal (n)	243	406	394	183	237	117	526	726	541	1015	141	264	799	727	227
- non-contact (n)	157	188	447	142	1103	753	260	79	744	1074	372	117	1407	49	195
- other unproductive(n)	340	152	22	64	3	40	138	79	196	331	95	110	309	232	22
- completed cases (n)	1001	921	1067	1401	1322	1309	1837	1613	1200	1605	1371	1002	2171	1216	2871
- partially completed (n)			1					3							13

⁺ for calculation of response figures, see appendix.

Data

	AUS	BG	CDN	CH	CY	CZ	D	DK	DO	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL
Were any measures of coding reliability employed?																
	Yes	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
	No		X	X									X			
Was the keying of the data verified?																
	Yes:							X ^{DK}								
Approximate proportion (%)					10	100				23		1	100	100	10	15
	No	X	X	X			X		X		X					
Were any reliability checks made on derived variables?																
	Yes	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
	No															X

^{DK} Keying of the data was verified, but not approx. proportion reported.

Data (continued)

	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NZ	P	ROK	RP	RUS	S	SLO	TW	USA	ZA
<i>Were any measures of coding reliability employed?</i>															
Yes	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
No		X				X				X					
<i>Was the keying of the data verified?</i>															
Yes:															
Approximate proportion (%)		100		100	15		100	100	100		10		100	X	100
No	X		X			X				X		X			
<i>Were any reliability checks made on derived variables?</i>															
Yes		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
No	X		X									X			

Data (continued)

	AUS	BG	CDN	CH	CY	CZ	D	DK	DO	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL
<i>Data checks/edits on:</i>																
- filters	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
- logic or consistency	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
- ranges	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Were data errors corrected?</i>																
Yes:																
- individually	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
- automatically		X								X		X			X	
No																
<i>Were the data weighted or post-stratified?</i>																
Yes		X	X	X		X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	
No	X				X		X	X	X							X

Data (continued)

	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NZ	P	ROK	RP	RUS	S	SLO	TW	USA	ZA
<i>Data checks/edits on:</i>															
- filters	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
- logic or consistency	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
- ranges	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Were data errors corrected?</i>															
Yes:															
- individually	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	
- automatically		X			X	X				X	X	X			X
No															
<i>Were the data weighted or post-stratified?</i>															
Yes	X						X		X	X	X		X	X	X
No		X	X	X	X	X		X			X	X			

Documentation

	AUS	BG	CDN	CH	CY	CZ	D	DK	DO	E	F	FIN	FL	GB	H	IL
Is a national methods report available for your study?																
Yes	X		X	X			X						X		X	
No		X			X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X		X

	IRL	J	LV	MEX	N	NZ	P	ROK	RP	RUS	S	SLO	TW	USA	ZA
Is a national methods report available for your study?															
Yes	X				X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
No		X	X	X		X	X								X

Appendix

Please provide information about the other study(ies) the ISSP was fielded with (e.g., topic, survey name).		
1	Australia	The ISSP 2005 module was fielded together with the Australian Survey of Social Attitudes (AuSSA) 2005. AuSSA is a biennial general social survey of Australian attitudes on subjects including work, education, families, crime, community, and taxes and government spending.
2	Bulgaria	ISSP 2004 was fielded together with questions on daily problems.
3	Canada	The ISSP 2005 module was fielded together with the 2006 module on Role of Government.
4	Czech Republic	The ISSP 2005 module was fielded together with a survey which included several country specific questions about character of respondent's employment, discrimination at work, job changes and getting ahead.
5	Denmark	The ISSP 2005 module was the main module. It was fielded together with an additional battery of 14 questions.
6	Flanders	The ISSP 2005 module was fielded together with the annual survey 'Social-cultural changes in Flanders-Belgium.' Apart from the classical background variables of respondent and partner, the face-to-face questionnaire contained the following themes: membership of different organisations, extended module on information and communication technology, political efficacy scale, social network, health condition, extended module on environment, trust in government and institutions, leisure time, and active sport.
7	Germany	The ISSP 2005 module was fielded together with ALLBUS (German General Social Survey). ALLBUS 2006 mainly deals with ethnic groups but also covers topics such as religiosity, attitudes towards politics and economy, family, and trust in people and politicians.
8	Great Britain	Fielded as part of the British Social Attitudes survey which covers attitudes towards a range of social, moral and political issues.
9	Hungary	The ISSP 2005 module was fielded as a part of the regular Omnibus survey of TARKI for November, 2005.
10	Ireland	The ISSP 2005 module was fielded together with the ISSP 2006 module (Role of Government IV).
11	Latvia	The ISSP 2005 module was fielded together with a study on unemployment, gender roles in the family, and favourite TV broadcasts.
12	New Zealand	Some New Zealand-specific questions were added between the ISSP module and the demographics questions.

Please provide information about the other study(ies) the ISSP was fielded with (e.g., topic, survey name).		
13	Norway	The ISSP 2005 module was fielded together with a survey on fringe benefits, work autonomy, and decision making.
14	The Philippines	The ISSP 2005 module was fielded together with a survey including quality of life indicators, awareness of news events, performance rating of government officials and institutions, and opinion on current issues.
15	Portugal	The ISSP 2005 module was fielded together with the ISSP 2006 Role of Government module and a Portuguese module on Labour Relations.
16	Russia	The ISSP 2005 module was fielded together with a regular omnibus survey.
17	Slovenia	The ISSP 2005 module was fielded together with a general national social survey on perception of social and economic conditions, values, political attitudes, etc.
18	South Africa	The ISSP 2005 module was fielded together with the South African Social Attitude Survey (SASAS). Other topics included in the survey were democracy and governance issues, national identity, service delivery, health status, HIV/Aids issues, moral issues, family and lifestyle issues and poverty.
19	South Korea	The ISSP 2005 module was fielded as part of the KGSS 2005 (Korean General Social Survey).
20	Spain	The ISSP 2005 module was fielded together with a survey on economic, social, political and current issues as well as on mass media.
21	Switzerland	The ISSP 2005 module was fielded together with the MOSAiCH 2005 (Measurement and Observation of Social Attitudes in Switzerland), which is the continuation of the "Eurobarometer in Switzerland". The MOSAiCH survey 2005 contains questions on the relation of Switzerland to the EU (trust in institutions, geographical attachment...), a small module on social networks, a quite large socio-demographical part, and the ISSP modules 2004 and 2005.
22	Taiwan	The ISSP 2005 module was fielded together with the TSCS (Taiwan Social Change Survey). Other topics included in the survey were daily life and international contacts, work achievements and expectations, attitude towards economy, family structure, occupation, emerging working pattern, gender and work, and income.
23	USA	The ISSP 2005 module was fielded together with the General Social Survey which includes core GSS variables and several topical modules. The 2006 GSS, however, asked items on 2005 Work Orientation module to the respondents sampled for ISSP and international mental health study only. Accordingly, the respondents were asked only about relatively shortened demographics that can be used for the required ISSP background questions.

Calculation of Response Figures Based on Reported Figures

Report Category	Face-to-Face Questionnaire Category	Mail Questionnaire Category
Issued sample (n)	Total number of starting or issued names/addresses (gross sample size)	Total number of starting or issued names/addresses (gross sample size)
Ineligible (n)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Addresses which could not be traced at all/ selected respondents who could not be traced - Addresses established as empty, demolished or containing no private dwellings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Addresses which could not be traced - Addresses established as empty, demolished or containing no private dwellings - Details of address wrong (street numbers, post codes, etc.) - Addresses with no letter boxes - Selected respondent unknown at address - Selected respondent moved, no forwarding address - Selected respondent deceased
Eligible (n)	Issued sample minus Ineligible	Issued sample minus Ineligible
Refusal (n)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Personal refusal at selected address - Proxy refusal (on behalf of selected respondent) - Other refusal at selected address 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Refusal by selected respondent - Refusal by another person - Implicit refusals (empty envelopes, empty questionnaires returned)
Non-contact (n)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No contact at selected address - No contact with selected person 	No contact
Other unproductive (n)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Selected respondent too sick / incapacitated to participate - Selected respondent had inadequate understanding of language of survey - Selected respondent away during survey period - Other type of unproductive reaction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Selected respondent too sick / incapacitated to participate - Selected respondent had inadequate understanding of language of survey - Selected respondent away during survey period - Other type of unproductive reaction
Completed cases (n)	Full productive interview	Completed returned questionnaires (net sample size)
Partially completed (n)	Partial productive interview	Partially completed returned questionnaires

ISSP Study Monitoring Questionnaires for Face-to-Face and Mail Surveys

***INTERNATIONAL
SOCIAL
SURVEY
PROGRAMME***

Study Monitoring Questionnaire

PLEASE COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE USING THE
WORK ORIENTATIONS 2005 ISSP MODULE AS YOUR REFERENCE.

RETURN TO: issp@zuma-mannheim.de

1a. Please enter the name of your institute and your country:

Institute:

Country:

1b. Please enter the name of the principal investigator and your contact person for questions about the study:

Principal
Investigator:

Contact
Person:

2a. What kind of institute fielded the module?

An institute principally doing market research

☐

An institute principally doing academic research

☐

An institute doing both market and academic research

☐

Other (please write in details)

☐

2b. Which institute carried out the fielding?

Our ISSP member
institute itself

☐

OR

Institute
name:

3a. Was the questionnaire fielded ...

only in English

☐

→ Question 39

in English plus other language(s)

☐

→ Question 3b

only in translation

☐

→ Question 3b

3b. Please enter the language(s) the module was fielded in.

Please write in: **Language 1 to Language X**

4. Was the questionnaire for language 1 ...?

a written translation (a questionnaire/application) ☐ → Question 5

an oral translation (interviewer translated on the spot) ☐ → Question 11

5. Who carried out translation 1? Please tick all that apply.

A member or members of the research team ☐

A translation bureau ☐

One or more specially trained translators ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

6. Was translation 1 checked?

Yes, all of the questionnaire ☐ → Question 7

Yes, only the new questions ☐ → Question 7

No ☐ → Question 8

7. How was translation 1 checked?

Group discussion ☐

Expert checked it ☐

Back translation ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in:

8. Was the translation 1 questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes ☐

No ☐

9. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 1? Please tick all that apply.

No problems ☐ →Question 11

Answer scales ☐

Instructions ☐

Whole questions ☐

Words or concepts ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:

10. What did you do about any problems in translation 1?

Please enter details:

11. Was the questionnaire for language 2 ...? (answer only if you have two or more translations/languages, otherwise continue with question 39)

a written translation (a questionnaire/application) ☐ →Question 12

an oral translation (interviewer translated on the spot) ☐ →Question 18

12. Who carried out translation 2? Please tick all that apply.

A member or members of the research team ☐

A translation bureau ☐

One or more specially trained translators ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

13. Was translation 2 checked?

Yes, all of the questionnaire ☐ →Question 14

Yes, only the new questions ☐ →Question 14

No ☐ →Question 15

14. How was translation 2 checked?

Group discussion ☐

Expert checked it ☐

Back translation ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in:

15. Was the translation 2 questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes ☐

No ☐

16. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 2? Please tick all that apply.

No problems ☐ → Question 18

Answer scales ☐

Instructions ☐

Whole questions ☐

Words or concepts ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:

17. What did you do about any problems in translation 2?

Please enter details:

18. Was the questionnaire for language 3 ...? **[answer only if you have three or more translations/languages, otherwise continue with question 39]**

a written translation (a questionnaire/application) ☐ → Question 19
an oral translation (interviewer translated on the spot) ☐ → Question 25

19. Who carried out translation 3? Please tick all that apply.

A member or members of the research team ☐
A translation bureau ☐
One or more specially trained translators ☐
Other (please write in details) ☐

20. Was translation 3 checked?

Yes, all of the questionnaire ☐ → Question 21
Yes, only the new questions ☐ → Question 21
No ☐ → Question 22

21. How was translation 3 checked?

Group discussion ☐
Expert checked it ☐
Back translation ☐
Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in:

22. Was the translation 3 questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes ☐
No ☐

23. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 3?
Please tick all that apply.

No problems ☐ →Question 25

Answer scales ☐

Instructions ☐

Whole questions ☐

Words or concepts ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:

24. What did you do about any problems in translation 3?

Please enter details:

25. Was the questionnaire for language 4 ...? **(answer only if you have four or more translations/languages, otherwise continue with question 39)**

a written translation (a questionnaire/application) ☐ →Question 26

an oral translation (interviewer translated on the spot) ☐ →Question 32

26. Who carried out translation 4? Please tick all that apply.

A member or members of the research team ☐

A translation bureau ☐

One or more specially trained translators ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

27. Was translation 4 checked?

Yes, all of the questionnaire ☐ →Question 28

Yes, only the new questions ☐ →Question 28

No ☐ →Question 29

28. How was translation 4 checked?

Group discussion ☐

Expert checked it ☐

Back translation ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in:

29. Was the translation 4 questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes ☐

No ☐

30. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 4? Please tick all that apply.

No problems ☐ → Question 32

Answer scales ☐

Instructions ☐

Whole questions ☐

Words or concepts ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:

31. What did you do about any problems in translation 4?

Please enter details:

32. Was the questionnaire for language 5 ...? **(answer only if you have five or more translations/languages, otherwise continue with question 39)**

a written translation (a questionnaire/application) ☐ → Question 33
an oral translation (interviewer translated on the spot) ☐ → Question 39

33. Who carried out translation 5? Please tick all that apply.

A member or members of the research team ☐
A translation bureau ☐
One or more specially trained translators ☐
Other (please write in details) ☐

34. Was translation 5 checked?

Yes, all of the questionnaire ☐ → Question 35
Yes, only the new questions ☐ → Question 35
No ☐ → Question 36

35. How was translation 5 checked?

Group discussion ☐
Expert checked it ☐
Back translation ☐
Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in:

36. Was the translation 5 questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes ☐
No ☐

37. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 5? Please tick all that apply.

No problems ☐ → Question 39

Answer scales ☐

Instructions ☐

Whole questions ☐

Words or concepts ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:

38. What did you do about any problems in translation 5?

Please enter details:

39. What data collection methods were used for the module (substantive and background questions)?

Face-to-face ☐

Self-completion (with some interviewer involvement in delivering or collecting) ☐

'Mixed mode': part self-completion, part face-to-face (please write in details) ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

If 'mixed mode' or other, please write in:

40. Were postal or telephone components used at any point (e.g., advance contacts)?

Yes - postal ☐ → Question 41

Yes - telephone ☐ → Question 41

No ☐ → Question 42

41. Please give details of the postal and/or telephone components.

Please enter details:

42. Were incentives offered?

Yes, to respondent ☐

Yes, to interviewer ☐

No, neither to respondent nor to interviewer ☐

43. How was the ISSP module fielded in your country?

As an individual survey (that is, the ISSP module was the whole survey) ☐ → Question 46

As part of a larger survey ☐ → Question 44

44. Please provide information about the other stud(ies) the ISSP was fielded with (e.g., topic, survey name).

Please enter:

45. What was the approximate position of the Work Orientations module in the larger questionnaire?

Start of questionnaire ☐

Middle of questionnaire ☐

End of questionnaire ☐

46. Were the substantive questions in the Work Orientations module all asked in the prescribed order?

Yes ☐ → Question 48

Yes, apart from omissions ☐ → Question 47

No ☐ → Question 47

47. Why was the question order changed?

Please enter:

48. Were all the core ISSP questions included in your questionnaire (by core we mean all required substantive and background questions)?

Yes – all Work Orientations questions and background questions included ☐ → Question 50

No – substantive question(s) from Work Orientations module missing ☐ → Question 49

No – required background ISSP question(s) missing ☐ → Question 49

49. Please provide details of the questions missing and indicate why they are missing.

ISSP source questionnaire: question number or description of question:

Reason(s) why missing:

Here we ask questions on sampling.

50. First, was your sample designed to be representative of ...

Only adult citizens of your country? ☐

Adults of any nationality residing in your country? ☐

51. Second, was your sample designed to be representative of ...

Only adults living in private accommodation? ☐ → Question 52

Adults living in private and in institutional accommodation
(e.g., residential homes for the elderly, asylum accommodation)? ☐

If private and institutional, please enter details in box below.

Please enter in:

52. Third, what was the lower age cut-off for your sample?

WRITE IN :

53. Was there any upper age cut-off for your sample?

Yes - please write in cut-off

No cut-off ☐

54. Were any groups excluded or under-represented in your sample design, apart from the age cut-offs or citizenship requirements just asked about?

No ☐

Yes (please write in details) ☐

If yes, write in details:

55. Did you use any variables for stratification?

Yes ☐ → Question 56

No ☐ → Question 57

56. Please describe the stratification variables used?

Please write in:

57. How many of stages does your sampling design have?

- One stage ☐
- Two stages ☐
- Three stages ☐
- Four stages ☐

58. Does your sampling frame consist of...?

- Addresses ☐
- Households ☐
- Named individuals (the target persons) ☐
- Named individuals (not the target persons) ☐
- Areas ☐
- Something else (please write in details) ☐

59. Please describe your sampling frame (e.g., population register, electoral roll, telephone directory and its coverage and updating).

Please write in:

60. Please describe your sampling method and your sampled units for the first stage?

Please write in:

61. Please describe your sampling method and your sampled units for the second stage?

(only if you have two or more stages, otherwise continue with question 64)

Please write in:

62. Please describe your sampling method and your sampled units for the third stage?

(only if you have three or more stages, otherwise continue with question 64)

Please write in:

63. Please describe your sampling method and your sampled units for the fourth stage?

(only if you have four stages, otherwise continue with question 64)

Please write in:

64. What selection method was used to identify a respondent?

Please tick all that apply. (do not answer if your sampling frame consists of named individuals – which are the target persons. Then continue with question 66)

Kish grid ☐

Last (or next) birthday ☐

Quota ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

65. Please describe your quota procedures. (only if you used quota, otherwise continue with question 66)

Please write in:

66. Was substitution or replacement permitted at any stage of your selection process or during fieldwork?

Yes ☐

→Question 67

No ☐

→Question 68

67. Please provide details of the substitution or replacement procedures used.

Please write in:

68. All in all, what are the known limitations (biases) of your net sample?
For example: is there differential coverage of particular groups, either because of sample design or response differences?

Please write in:

69. Please fill in the following details about your issued sample.

Some categories may well not apply, but please complete to the highest level of detail possible.

- | | |
|---|--|
| Total number of <u>starting</u> or <u>issued</u> names/addresses (gross sample size) | <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> |
| - addresses which could not be traced at all | <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> |
| - selected respondents who could not be traced | |
| - addresses established as empty, demolished or containing no private dwellings | <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> |
| - selected respondent too sick/incapacitated to participate | <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> |
| - selected respondent away during survey period | <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> |
| - selected respondent had inadequate understanding of language of survey | <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> |
| - no contact at selected address | <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> |
| - no contact with selected person | <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> |
| - personal refusal at selected address | <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> |
| - proxy refusal (on behalf of selected respondent) | <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> |
| - other refusal at selected address | <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> |
| - other type of unproductive reaction (please write in full details in the box below) | <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> |
| - full productive interview (net sample size) | <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> |
| - partial productive interview | <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> |

More information or Other type of unproductive reaction

Please write in:

70. Here we ask for information about interviewer procedures.

a. Were interviewers paid according to realized cases?

Yes ☐

No ☐

b. Which, if any, of these rules governed how an interviewer approached an address/household?

PLEASE TICK THOSE THAT APPLY

Calls/visits must be made at different times of day ☐

Calls/visits must be made on different days of week ☐

Neither of the above ☐

c. Were interviewers required to make a certain number of calls/ visits before they stopped approaching an address or household?

Minimum number of calls/visits required - please write in number

No minimum call requirement ☐

d. Were any interviews supervised (that is, supervisor accompanies interviewer)?

Yes - please write in approximate proportion %

No ☐

e. Were any interviews back-checked (e.g. supervisor checks later whether interview conducted)?

Yes - please write in approximate proportion %

No ☐

71. Please write in the approximate start and end dates of fieldwork.

D D M M Y Y

Start date

End date

72. Were any measures of coding reliability employed?

Yes ☐

No ☐

73. Was keying of the data verified?

Yes - please write in approximate level of verification %

No ☐

74. Were any reliability checks made on derived variables (that is variables constructed on the basis of other variables collected)?

Yes ☐

No ☐

No derived variables ☐

75. Were data checked/edited to ensure that filter instructions were followed correctly?

Yes ☐

No ☐

76. Were data checked/edited for logic or consistency?

Yes ☐

No ☐

77. Were data checked/edited to ensure they fell within permitted ranges?

Yes ☐

No ☐

**If you answered YES for any question from Q72 to Q77, continue with Question 78.
If you answered NO for all questions Q72 to Q77, continue with Question 79.**

78. Were errors corrected?
Please tick all that apply.

Yes - individually ☐

Yes - automatically ☐

No - not corrected ☐

79. Were the data weighted or post-stratified?

Yes ☐

→ Question 80

No ☐

→ Question 81

80. Please briefly describe the weighting or post-stratification strategy used.

Please write in:

81. Is a national methods report available for your study?

Yes ☐

No ☐

82. If there is anything you would like to comment on, please do so here.

Please write in:

THANK YOU VERY MUCH

***INTERNATIONAL
SOCIAL
SURVEY
PROGRAMME***

Study Monitoring Questionnaire

PLEASE COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE USING THE
WORK ORIENTATIONS 2005 ISSP MODULE AS YOUR REFERENCE.

RETURN TO: issp@zuma-mannheim.de

1a. Please enter the name of your institute and your country:

Institute:

Country:

1b. Please enter the name of the principal investigator and your contact person for questions about the study:

Principal
Investigator:

Contact
Person:

2a. What kind of institute fielded the module?

An institute principally doing market research

☐

An institute principally doing academic research

☐

An institute doing both market and academic research

☐

Other (please write in details)

☐

2b. Which institute carried out the fielding?

Our ISSP member
institute itself

☐

OR

Institute
name:

3a. Was the questionnaire fielded ...

only in English

☐

→ Question 34

in English plus other language(s)

☐

→ Question 3b

only in translation

☐

→ Question 3b

3b. Please enter the language(s) the module was fielded in.

Please write in: **Language 1 to Language X**

4. Who carried out translation 1? Please tick all that apply.

A member or members of the research team

☐

A translation bureau

☐

One or more specially trained translators

☐

Other (please write in details)

☐

5. Was translation 1 checked?

Yes, all of the questionnaire ☐ → Question 6

Yes, only the new questions ☐ → Question 6

No ☐ → Question 7

6. How was translation 1 checked?

Group discussion ☐

Expert checked it ☐

Back translation ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in:

7. Was the translation 1 questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes ☐

No ☐

8. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 1? Please tick all that apply.

No problems ☐ → Question 10

Answer scales ☐

Instructions ☐

Whole questions ☐

Words or concepts ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:

9. What did you do about any problems in translation 1?

Please enter details:

10. Who carried out translation 2? Please tick all that apply.

(answer only if you have two or more translations/languages, otherwise continue with question 34)

A member or members of the research team ☐

A translation bureau ☐

One or more specially trained translators ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

11. Was translation 2 checked?

Yes, all of the questionnaire ☐ → Question 12

Yes, only the new questions ☐ → Question 12

No ☐ → Question 13

12. How was translation 2 checked?

Group discussion ☐

Expert checked it ☐

Back translation ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in:

13. Was the translation 2 questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes ☐

No ☐

14. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 2? Please tick all that apply.

No problems ☐ →Question 16

Answer scales ☐

Instructions ☐

Whole questions ☐

Words or concepts ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:

15. What did you do about any problems in translation 2?

Please enter details:

16. Who carried out translation 3? Please tick all that apply.

answer only if you have three or more translations/languages, otherwise continue with question 34)

A member or members of the research team ☐

A translation bureau ☐

One or more specially trained translators ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

17. Was translation 3 checked?

Yes, all of the questionnaire ☐ →Question 18

Yes, only the new questions ☐ →Question 18

No ☐ →Question 19

18. How was translation 3 checked?

Group discussion ☐

Expert checked it ☐

Back translation ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in:

19. Was the translation 3 questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes ☐

No ☐

20. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 3? Please tick all that apply.

No problems ☐ → Question 22

Answer scales ☐

Instructions ☐

Whole questions ☐

Words or concepts ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:

21. What did you do about any problems in translation 3?

Please enter details:

22. Who carried out translation 4? Please tick all that apply.

(answer only if you have four or more translations/languages, otherwise continue with question 34)

A member or members of the research team ☐

A translation bureau ☐

One or more specially trained translators ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

23. Was translation 4 checked?

Yes, all of the questionnaire ☐ → Question 24

Yes, only the new questions ☐ → Question 24

No ☐ → Question 25

24. How was translation 4 checked?

Group discussion ☐

Expert checked it ☐

Back translation ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in:

25. Was the translation 4 questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes ☐

No ☐

26. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 4? Please tick all that apply.

No problems ☐ →Question 28

Answer scales ☐

Instructions ☐

Whole questions ☐

Words or concepts ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:

27. What did you do about any problems in translation 4?

Please enter details:

28. Who carried out translation 5? Please tick all that apply.

(answer only if you have five or more translations/languages, otherwise continue with question 34)

A member or members of the research team ☐

A translation bureau ☐

One or more specially trained translators ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

29. Was translation 5 checked?

Yes, all of the questionnaire ☐ →Question 30

Yes, only the new questions ☐ →Question 30

No ☐ →Question 31

30. How was translation 5 checked?

Group discussion ☐

Expert checked it ☐

Back translation ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in:

31. Was the translation 5 questionnaire pre-tested?

Yes ☐

No ☐

32. Were there any questions, sections, words or concepts which caused problems when translating into language 5? Please tick all that apply.

No problems ☐ → Question 34

Answer scales ☐

Instructions ☐

Whole questions ☐

Words or concepts ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

Please write in details of problems checked/ticked above:

33. What did you do about any problems in translation 5?

Please enter details:

34. Here we ask questions on your mail survey.

- a. Were any contacts made by telephone or interviewer?
Please tick all that apply.

Yes - precontacts by telephone ☐

Yes - precontacts by personal visit ☐

Yes - reminders by telephone ☐

Yes - reminders by personal visit ☐

Yes - Other (please write in details) ☐

No - no telephone or personal (visit) contacts at all ☐

- b. How many mailings were sent out during fielding? Please enter number:

- c. What were the dates of mailings? (with multiple mailings, provide dates for the first three and the last)

1 d d m m y y y y

2 d d m m y y y y

3 d d m m y y y y

4 d d m m y y y y

- d. What was sent out in each mailing? Please check all that apply.

1. Mailing:

	YES	NO
Questionnaire	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Data protection information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Explanatory letter	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Incentive	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other material (Please write in details)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. Mailing (answer only if you have two or more mailings, otherwise continue with question 34e):

	YES	NO
Thank you and reminder combined	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Thank you sent only to respondents	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reminder sent only to non-respondents	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Questionnaire	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Data protection information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Explanatory letter	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Incentive	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other material (Please write in details)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. Mailing (answer only if you have three or more mailings, otherwise continue with question 34e):

	YES	NO
Questionnaire	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Data protection information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Explanatory letter	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Incentive	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other material (Please write in details)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4. Mailing (or last, if more than four mailings) (answer only if you have three or more mailings, otherwise continue with question 34e):

	YES	NO
Questionnaire	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Data protection information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Explanatory letter	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Incentive	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other material (Please write in details)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

e. When did the fielding period finish officially?

d	d	m	m	y	y	y	y
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

35. How was the ISSP module fielded in your country?

As an individual survey (that is, the ISSP module was the whole survey) ☐ →Question 38

As part of a larger survey ☐ →Question 36

36. Please provide information about the other stud(ies) the ISSP was fielded with (e.g., topic, survey name).

Please enter:

37. What was the approximate position of the Work Orientations module in the larger questionnaire?

Start of questionnaire ☐

Middle of questionnaire ☐

End of questionnaire ☐

38. Were the substantive questions in the Work Orientations module all asked in the prescribed order?

Yes ☐ →Question 40

Yes, apart from omissions ☐ →Question 39

No ☐ →Question 39

39. Why was the question order changed?

Please enter:

40. Were all the core ISSP questions included in your questionnaire (by core we mean all required substantive and background questions)?

Yes – all Work Orientations questions and background questions included ☐ → Question 42

No – substantive question(s) from Work Orientations module missing ☐ → Question 41

No – required background ISSP question(s) missing ☐ → Question 41

41. Please provide details of the questions missing and indicate why they are missing.

ISSP source questionnaire: question number or description of question:

Reason(s) why missing:

Here we ask questions on sampling.

42. First, was your sample designed to be representative of ...

Only adult citizens of your country? ☐

Adults of any nationality residing in your country? ☐

43. Second, was your sample designed to be representative of ...

Only adults living in private accommodation? ☐ → Question 44

Adults living in private and in institutional accommodation
(e.g., residential homes for the elderly, asylum accommodation)? ☐

If private and institutional, please enter details in box below.

Please enter in:

44. Third, what was the lower age cut-off for your sample?

WRITE IN :

45. Was there any upper age cut-off for your sample?

Yes - please write in cut-off

No cut-off ☐

46. Were any groups excluded or under-represented in your sample design, apart from the age cut-offs or citizenship requirements just asked about?

No ☐

Yes (please write in details) ☐

If yes, write in details:

47. Did you use any variables for stratification?

Yes ☐

→Question 48

No ☐

→Question 49

48. Please describe the stratification variables used?

Please write in:

49. How many of stages does your sampling design have?

One stage ☐

Two stages ☐

Three stages ☐

Four stages ☐

50. Does your sampling frame consist of...?

Addresses ☐

Households ☐

Named individuals (the target persons) ☐

Named individuals (not the target persons) ☐

Areas ☐

Something else (please write in details) ☐

51. Please describe your sampling frame (e.g., population register, electoral roll, telephone directory and its coverage and updating).

Please write in:

52. Please describe your sampling method and your sampled units for the first stage?

Please write in:

53. Please describe your sampling method and your sampled units for the second stage?

(only if you have two or more stages, otherwise continue with question 56)

Please write in:

54. Please describe your sampling method and your sampled units for the third stage?

(only if you have three or more stages, otherwise continue with question 56)

Please write in:

55. Please describe your sampling method and your sampled units for the fourth stage?

(only if you have four stages, otherwise continue with question 56)

Please write in:

56. What selection method was used to identify a respondent?

Please tick all that apply. (do not answer if your sampling frame consists of named individuals – which are the target persons. Then continue with question 58)

Kish grid ☐

Last (or next) birthday ☐

Quota ☐

Other (please write in details) ☐

57. Please describe your quota procedures. (only if you used quota, otherwise continue with question 58)

Please write in:

58. Was substitution or replacement permitted at any stage of your selection process or during fieldwork?

Yes ☐

→Question 59

No ☐

→Question 60

59. Please provide details of the substitution or replacement procedures used.

Please write in:

60. All in all, what are the known limitations (biases) of your net sample?

For example: is there differential coverage of particular groups, either because of sample design or response differences?

Please write in:

61. Please fill in the following details about your issued sample.

Some categories may well not apply, but please complete to the highest level of detail possible.

Total number of <u>starting</u> or <u>issued</u> names/addresses (gross sample size)	<input type="text"/>
- addresses which could not be traced	<input type="text"/>
- addresses established as empty, demolished or containing no private dwellings	<input type="text"/>
- details of address wrong (street numbers, post codes, etc.)	<input type="text"/>
- addresses with no letter boxes	<input type="text"/>
selected respondent unknown at address	<input type="text"/>
- selected respondent moved, no forwarding address	<input type="text"/>
- selected respondent too sick / incapacitated to participate	<input type="text"/>
- selected respondent deceased	<input type="text"/>
- selected respondent had inadequate understanding of language of survey	<input type="text"/>
- selected respondent away during survey period	<input type="text"/>
- refusal by selected respondent	<input type="text"/>
- refusal by another person	<input type="text"/>
- partial productive interview	<input type="text"/>
- implicit refusals (empty envelopes, empty questionnaires returned)	<input type="text"/>
- other type of unproductive reaction (please write in full details in the box below)	<input type="text"/>
- completed returned questionnaires (net sample size)	<input type="text"/>
- partially completed returned questionnaires	<input type="text"/>
- no contact	<input type="text"/>

More information or Other type of unproductive reaction

Please write in:

62. Were any measures of coding reliability employed?

Yes ☐

No ☐

63. Was keying of the data verified?

Yes - please write in approximate level of verification %

No ☐

64. Were any reliability checks made on derived variables (that is, variables constructed on the basis of other variables collected)?

Yes ☐

No ☐

No derived variables ☐

65. Were data checked/edited to ensure that filter instructions were followed correctly?

Yes ☐

No ☐

66. Were data checked/edited for logic or consistency?

Yes ☐

No ☐

67. Were data checked/edited to ensure they fell within permitted ranges?

Yes ☐

No ☐

**If you answered YES for any question from Q62 to Q67, continue with Question 68.
If you answered NO for all questions Q62 to Q67, continue with Question 69.**

68. Were errors corrected?
Please tick all that apply.

Yes - individually ☐

Yes - automatically ☐

No - not corrected ☐

69. Were the data weighted or post-stratified?

Yes ☐ → Question 70

No ☐ → Question 71

70. Please briefly describe the weighting or post-stratification strategy used.

Please write in:

71. Is a national methods report available for your study?

Yes ☐

No ☐

72. If there is anything you would like to comment on, please do so here.

Please write in:

THANK YOU VERY MUCH